

Local Work Group development of local EQIP.

Mower Soil and Water Conservation District FY03 EQIP

1. List the local resource concerns that EQIP can address: Soil Erosion and Water Quality
2. If applicable, list any geographic regions (i.e. watersheds, townships, etc.) and their respective resource concerns within the District to receive priority: Sensitive groundwater areas as identified on Mower County Geologic Atlas and areas contributing pollutants to surface water.
3. Prioritize and weight each local resource concern for the district. Weight must be between 1 and 10:

Factor	Resource Priority	Weight
A1. Erosion Control	Very High	10
A2 Gully Control	Very High	10
B1 Water Resource	High	10
B2 Wastewater/CNMP	Medium	5
C Habitat Improvement	Low	1
D Air Quality	Low	1
E Impaired Water	High	1
F Distance	High	10
G Grazing System	Low	1
H Forest Mgt.	Low	1
I Additional Local*	High	10

If the additional local concern is scored, describe the concern here and how points will be scored. Include any geographic priorities: Sensitive groundwater areas.

4. Attach the scoring worksheet as recommended by the District Conservationist (DC) for Mower SWCD: The DC is recommending a weight of 3 for Factor B2, because the LWG did not want Waste Management Practices to rank higher than erosion control practices. A weight of 1 for factor B1 is recommended because protection of water resources are given additional points under factor I local concerns.

Factor I will be scored as follows:

Points will be awarded based on Mower County Geologic Atlas Plate 9, *Sensitivity to Groundwater Pollution of Bedrock Aquifers*. Practices which may benefit groundwater, such as 590, 709, and 784 will be awarded 6 points if located in area with very high sensitivity rating, 4 points in high sensitivity, and 2 points medium sensitivity areas. Practice 351 and 725 will also score 6 points throughout the county.

OR

Points will be awarded for practices that reduce pollution to Mower County streams. Erosion, sediment, and waste control practices will be awarded 6 points if the sediment or animal waste discharges within 150 feet of a perennial stream, 4 points if discharge is within 150 feet of an intermittent stream, and 2 points if practice area discharges within 500 feet of a stream; and site poses a hazard to surface water quality.

5. List any recommended practices to be deleted from the state Conservation Practice Payment Document: None recommended.

The local EQIP program description, cost-share docket changes, and ranking worksheet must be reviewed and approved by the State Conservationist before any EQIP contract is approved and signed.

Chair, Local Work Group

Date

This document serves as the Local Work Group recommendation for FY 03 EQIP. Attached is a roster of participation in the Local Work Group:

Mower County Soil and Water Conservation District

Notes of Local Work Group Meeting on June 10, 2003

Supervisors Present: John Bramwell, SWCD
Jim Gebhard NRCS
Bill Lonergan SWCD
Peter Marx, SWCD

Staff Present: Mike Muzzy, NRCS District Conservationist
Bev Nordby, SWCD District Manager
Michelle Janssen, PA FSA
Leroy Sandven, CED FSA

Other Present: Melissa Berrios, NRCS Intern from Puerto Rico
Kari Good, NRCS Intern from New Mexico

Overview:

Mike Muzzy presented a PowerPoint presentation overview of the 2003 Environmental Quality Incentives Program (EQIP). Bev Nordby summarized the questions and comments of the stakeholders at the Public Input on Local Conservation Efforts meeting.

Ranking Meeting:

Soil erosion and water quality were determined the top priority local resource concerns to be addressed by EQIP. It was recommended that Sensitive Ground Water Map shall be used as a basis for geographic regions within the District to receive priority. Giving a weight of 10 for factors related to erosion and water resources was discussed. Soil erosion was discussed. It was commented that there is a lot of water erosion problems that may not be reflected by erosion prediction models (RUSLE), and therefore erosion control practices may not rank as high as they should. Wastewater/CNMP was discussed and general consensus was that due to the high cost and limited cost share that this should be weighted less, possible a 5. There was concern that this would affect applications sent on for area pool, but weights are for local consideration and will not be applied for area rankings.

It was suggested that additional Local factors will be applied for sensitive ground water areas based on the Karst map. Surface water quality was discussed including bacteria, sediment and nutrient problems in streams. Sites that are a source of pollutants in streams and rivers should receive extra consideration. No-till was discussed and there was no consensus, Leroy thought no-till incentives were a poor use of cost share, Mike and Bev thought it should be high priority.

List of available practices was discussed no suggested additions or deletions. Time ran out on the meeting before a final ranking form was developed. It was left up to Mike to finalize a ranking system that would address erosion control and water quality problems.